

### **REMARKS**

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-10, 12-19, 21-25 and 27-31 are rejected. Claims 1, 9 and 18 were objected due to certain informalities. Claims 6-8 and 13-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. By the present Response, claims 1, 12 and 19 have been amended and claims 2, 4, 6-7, 11, 16-17, 20 and 23-31 canceled. No new matter has been added. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1, 3, 5, 8-10, 12-15, 18-19, and 21-22 will remain pending in the present patent application. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

### **Objections to claims**

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 9 and 18 due to certain informalities. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 has been amended to correct “fault mode” to “second mode” and now does not lack proper antecedent basis.

The Examiner objected to claims 9 and 18 as they refer “zigzag” winding. Applicant respectfully submits that “zigzag” refers to a specific winding arrangement in transformers and is well known in the art. A zigzag winding is one in which the winding is split in the middle into two windings. The outer winding is turned around and rejoined to the next phase in the sequence. For further information on zigzag transformers in general, please refer to the following link:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zigzag\\_transformer](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zigzag_transformer)

Applicant respectfully respects the Examiner to withdraw the objection of claims 1, 8 and 18.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Office Action summarizes claims 1, 3-5, 9-10, 19, 30 and 31 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Genuit et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,846,695; hereinafter “Genuit”) in view of Magid (U.S. Patent No. 5,001,623). Claims 12 and 18 was

rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Genuit in view of Magid and further in view of Adams (U.S. Patent No. 6,486,640; hereinafter “Adams”).

By the present response, claims 1 and 12 have been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claims 6 and 7, and 16 and 17, respectively, which are indicated as being allowable by the Examiner. Claim 19 has been amended to specify the electrical parameter to include either a voltage or a current. Claim 4 has been canceled.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit independent claim 1, 12 and 19, and their dependent claims are allowable and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of claims 1, 3,5, 9-10, 19, 30 and 31.

The Office Action summarized claim 21 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Genuit in view of Magid and further in view of Kammeter (U.S. Patent No. 5,343,080; hereinafter “Kammeter”). The Office Action summarized claim 22 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Genuit in view of Magid and Kammeter and further in view of Weeber (U.S. Patent No. 6,897,577; hereinafter “Weeber”).

The claims rejected under this section depend indirectly from independent claim 19. Consequently, claim 21 and 22 is believed to be patentable both by virtue of its dependency from an allowable base claim, as well as for the subject matter it separately recites. Reconsideration and allowance of dependent claim 21 and 22 on this basis are requested.

The Office Action summarized claim 23 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Genuit in view of Magid and Kammeter and further in view of Frutschi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,945,052; hereinafter “Frutschi”). The Office Action summarized claim 24 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over

Genuit in view Kammeter and Frutschi. The Office Action further summarized claim 25 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Genuit in view of Kammeter and Frutschi, and further in view of Weeber. The Office Action further summarized claims 27-29 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Genuit in view Magid and Frutschi and further in view of Weeber. By the present response, claims 23-25 and 27-29 have been canceled, and their rejection is now moot.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 14, 2008

/Patrick S. Yoder/  
Patrick S. Yoder  
Reg. No. 37,479  
FLETCHER YODER  
P.O. Box 692289  
Houston, TX 77269-2289  
(281) 970-4545